

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH,
NORTHERN DIVISION

RVLock & Co., LLC v. MNDZ, LLC and Nicholas Menendez

RVLock · No. 1:25-cv-00182 · Decided April 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah granted in part and denied in part RVLock & Co., LLC’s motions to seal portions of its complaint and amended complaint. The court denied the defendants’ motion to seal an employment contract, ordered that only paragraphs 64 and 65 of the pleadings remain sealed, and directed the clerk to unseal the related filing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Northern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daphne A. Oberg
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Northern Division
DECIDED	April 20, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00182
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties filed motions to seal portions of the complaint, first amended complaint, and an employment contract attached to an opposition brief. The court resolved the motions under the common-law right of public access to judicial records and the District of Utah's local sealing rule.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the common-law presumption of public access to judicial records and required the party seeking sealing to show a significant countervailing interest that heavily outweighs the public interest in access.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- trade secrets
- misappropriation of trade secrets
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether portions of RVLock's complaint and first amended complaint discussing an employment contract should remain under seal.
2. Whether the employment contract attached to defendants' opposition should be filed under seal.
3. Whether allegations concerning RVLock's product, supplier, and business plans contain proprietary information sufficient to overcome the presumption of public access.

HOLDINGS

1. The requests to seal information concerning the employment contract were denied because RVLock abandoned its request and the asserted interest in preserving the contract's confidentiality was insufficient, without more, to overcome the presumption of public access.
2. Paragraphs 64 and 65 of the complaint and first amended complaint may remain sealed because they appear to disclose RVLock's product, supplier, and business plans, and RVLock demonstrated an interest sufficient to justify sealing those limited portions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Courts have long recognized a common-law right of access to judicial records.”

“The burden is on the party seeking to restrict access to show some significant interest that outweighs the presumption.”

“documents containing sensitive, proprietary information concerning a party’s business practices may properly be sealed”

“a mere “interest in preserving the confidentiality of [a] contract does not necessarily constitute a sufficiently substantial justification.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

RVLock brought a trade-secret-misappropriation action against MNDZ, LLC and Nicholas Menendez. Its complaint and first amended complaint discussed provisions of an employment contract and, in paragraphs 64 and 65, a supplier, a product, and business plans. Defendants attached the employment contract to their opposition and sought to seal it solely because RVLock had asserted that it was confidential.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

RVLock moved to file its complaint and first amended complaint under seal, asserting that portions contained confidential employment-contract and trade-secret information. Defendants opposed and separately moved to seal the contract attached to their opposition. RVLock abandoned its request to seal contract-related information but continued to seek protection for allegations concerning a supplier, product, and business plans. The court denied the requests concerning the contract, granted limited sealing of paragraphs 64 and 65, and ordered the contract filing unsealed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Colony Ins. Co. v. Burke, 698 F.3d 1222, 1241 (10th Cir. 2012)
- Mann v. Boatright, 477 F.3d 1140, 1149 (10th Cir. 2007)
- Deherrera v. Decker Truck Line, Inc., 820 F.3d 1147, 1162 n.8 (10th Cir. 2016)
- Braun v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., 719 F. App'x 782, 801 n.8 (10th Cir. 2017)
- Sacchi v. IHC Health Servs., Inc., 918 F.3d 1155, 1160 (10th Cir. 2019)

OPINION

MNDZ

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

NORTHERN DIVISION

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND

RVLOCK & CO, LLC, a Utah limited liability

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND

company,

DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S

MOTIONS TO SEAL

Plaintiff,

(DOC. NOS. 2 & 21) AND

DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION

v.

TO SEAL (DOC. NO. 26)

MNDZ, LLC, a Utah limited liability Case No. 1:25-cv-00182 company; and NICHOLAS MENENDEZ, an individual, District Judge Tena Campbell Defendants. Magistrate Judge Daphne A. Oberg In this trade secret misappropriation action, the parties have filed various motions to seal.¹ RVLock & Co, LLC, has moved for leave to file its complaint and first amended complaint under seal, generally asserting certain paragraphs contain "information from a confidential employment contract as well as trade secret information."² MNDZ, LLC, and Nicholas Menendez oppose, arguing the contract is a standard document with no 1 (Pl.'s Mot. for Leave to File [Compl.] Under Seal 1, Doc. No. 2; Pl.'s Mot. for Leave to File [Am. Compl.] Under Seal 1, Doc. No. 21; Defs.' Mot. for Leave to File Under Seal Ex. A to Defs.' Opp'n to Mot. for Leave to File Under Seal, Doc. No. 26.) 2 (Mot. for Leave to File [Compl.] Under Seal 1, Doc. No. 2; Mot. for Leave to File [Am. Compl.] Under Seal 1, Doc. No. 21.) Both motions seek to seal the same

paragraphs of each pleading. (See Sealed Compl. ¶¶ 15–23, Doc. No. 3 (discussing provisions of employment contract); Sealed Am. Compl. ¶¶ 15–23, Doc. No. 22 (same); see also Sealed Compl. ¶¶ 64–65, Doc. No. 3 (discussing transition document); Sealed Am. Compl. ¶¶ 64–65, Doc. No. 22 (same).) sensitive information.³ The defendants attached a copy of the contract to their opposition, which they separately seek to seal solely because RVLock asserts it is confidential.⁴ In reply, RVLock abandons its request to seal information concerning the contract.⁵ But RVLock argues paragraphs 64 and 65 of its complaint and first amended complaint name a supplier and discuss business plans for a product, which is confidential and proprietary information that would affect the company’s competitiveness if disclosed.⁶ RVLock’s motions are granted in part and denied in part, and the defendants’ motion is denied. “Courts have long recognized a common-law right of access to judicial records.”⁷ Indeed, the District of Utah’s local rules provide that court records are “presumptively open to the public,” and sealing of court records is “highly discouraged.”⁸ But the right of public access is “not absolute.”⁹ “[T]he presumption in favor of access to judicial records may be overcome where countervailing interests heavily outweigh the 3 (Opp’n to Mot. for Leave to File Under Seal (Opp’n) 2–3, Doc. No. 25.) 4 (Defs.’ Mot. for Leave to File Under Seal Ex. A to Opp’n, Doc. No. 26.) 5 (Reply in Supp. of Mot. for Leave to File Under Seal 3, Doc. No. 30 (explaining it sought to seal the portions discussing the contract “out of an abundance of caution” and, in light of the defendants’ opposition, “is amenable to unsealing information concerning the contract”).) 6 (See *id.* at 2–3.) 7 *Colony Ins. Co. v. Burke*, 698 F.3d 1222, 1241 (10th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Mann v. Boatright*, 477 F.3d 1140, 1149 (10th Cir. 2007)). 8 DUCivR 5-3(a)(1). 9 *Colony Ins. Co.*, 698 F.3d at 1241 (citation omitted). public interests in access.”¹⁰ “The burden is on the party seeking to restrict access to show some significant interest that outweighs the presumption.”¹¹ For example, documents containing sensitive, proprietary information concerning a party’s business practices may properly be sealed,¹² whereas a mere “interest in preserving the confidentiality of [a] contract does not necessarily constitute a sufficiently substantial justification.”¹³ Here, because RVLock no longer seeks to seal information concerning the contract, the defendants’ motion to file the contract under seal and RVLock’s motions to seal the paragraphs in its pleadings discussing the contract are denied. But where paragraphs 64 and 65 of the complaint and first amended complaint appear to discuss RVLock’s product, supplier, and business plans, RVLock has demonstrated an interest sufficient to justify sealing these limited portions of the pleadings.¹⁴ Accordingly, RVLock’s motions are granted as to paragraphs 64 and 65. 10 *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). 11 *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). 12 See *Deherrera v. Decker Truck Line, Inc.*, 820 F.3d 1147, 1162 n.8 (10th Cir. 2016); *Braun v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.*, 719 F. App’x 782, 801 n.8 (10th Cir. 2017) (unpublished). 13 *Sacchi v. IHC Health Servs., Inc.*, 918 F.3d 1155, 1160 (10th Cir. 2019). 14 This ruling may be revisited if, at a later stage in the case, it can be shown RVLock’s continued interest in sealing the information no longer heavily outweighs the public’s interest in access.

CONCLUSION

RVLock's motions to seal'® are granted in part and denied in part, the defendants' motion to seal'® is denied. The court orders as follows:

1. Within seven days, RVLlock must file new versions of the complaint and first amended complaint, redacting only the provisions identified in paragraphs 64 and 65. The unredacted versions of these pleadings' shall remain sealed until otherwise ordered.
2. The document temporarily sealed'® in connection with the defendants' opposition brief shall be unsealed. Specifically, the clerk is directed to unseal the filing at docket number 28. DATED this 20th day of April, 2026. BY THE COURT: dapetcel. iesg— United States Magistrate Judge 1S (Doc. Nos. 2 & 21.) 16 (Doc. No. 26.) 17 (Doc. Nos. 3 & 22.) 18 (Doc. No. 28.)